arXiv:1508.03939v1 [math.RA] 17 Aug 2015

LOCAL DERIVATIONS ON FINITE-DIMENSIONAL LIE ALGEBRAS

SHAVKAT AYUPOV AND KARIMBERGEN KUDAYBERGENOV

ABSTRACT. We prove that every local derivation on a finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebra over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero is a derivation. We also give examples of finite-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras $\mathcal{L}$ with $\dim \mathcal{L} \geq 3$ which admit local derivations which are not derivations.

Keywords: Semisimple Lie algebra, nilpotent Lie algebra, filiform Lie algebra, derivation, local derivation.

AMS Subject Classification: 16W25, 16W10, 17B20, 17B40.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1990, Kadison [9] and Larson and Sourour [10] introduce the following concept of local derivation: let X be a Banach A-bimodule over a Banach algebra A, a linear mapping $\Delta : A \to X$ is said to be a *local derivation* if for every x in A there exists a derivation $D_x : A \to X$, depending on x, satisfying $\Delta(x) = D_x(x)$.

The main problems concerning this notion are to find conditions under which local derivations become derivations and to present examples of algebras with local derivations that are not derivations [4, 9, 10]. Kadison proves in [9, Theorem A] that each continuous local derivation of a von Neumann algebra M into a dual Banach M-bimodule is a derivation. This theorem gave rise to studies and several results on local derivations on C*-algebras, culminating with a definitive contribution due to Johnson, which asserts that every continuous local derivation of a C*-algebra A into a Banach A-bimodule is a derivation [8, Theorem 5.3]. Moreover in his paper, Johnson also gives an automatic continuity result by proving that local derivations of a C*-algebra A into a Banach A-bimodule X are continuous even if not assumed a priori to be so (cf. [8, Theorem 7.5]).

Investigation of local derivations on (non necessarily Banach) algebras of unbounded operators were initiated in papers [1] and [2].

The paper [1] is devoted to the study of local derivations on the algebra $S(M, \tau)$ of all τ-measurable operators affiliated with a von Neumann algebra M and a faithful normal semifinite trace τ. One of main results in the mentioned paper presents an unbounded version of Kadison's Theorem A from [9] and it asserts that every local derivation on $S(M, \tau)$ which is continuous in the measure topology automatically becomes a derivation. In particular in the case of the type I von Neumann algebra M all such local derivations on $S(M, \tau)$ are inner derivations. Moreover for type I finite von Neumann algebras without abelian direct

---

Date: August 25, 2015.

summands as well as for von Neumann algebras with the atomic lattice of projections, the continuity condition on local derivations is redundant. In [2] it was proved that each local derivation on the so-called non commutative Arens algebras affiliated with a von Neumann algebra M and a faithful normal semi-finite trace τ is automatically a derivation.

The paper [1] also deals with the problem of existence of local derivations which are not derivations on algebras of measurable operators. The consideration of such examples on various finite- and infinite dimensional algebras was initiated by Kadison, Kaplansky and Jensen (see [9]). In [1] this problem has been solved for a class of commutative regular algebras, which include the algebras of measurable functions on a measure space. Namely necessary and sufficient conditions were obtained for the algebras of measurable and τ-measurable operators affiliated with a commutative von Neumann algebra to admit local derivations that are not derivations.

In [3] we initiated the study of derivation type maps on non associative algebras, namely, we investigated so-called 2-local derivations on finite-dimensional Lie algebras, and showed an essential difference between semisimple and nilpotent Lie algebras in the behavior of their 2-local derivations.

The present paper is devoted to local derivation on finite-dimensional Lie algebra over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero.

After preliminaries we prove in Section 3 the main result of the paper which asserts that every local derivation on a finite dimensional semisimple Lie algebra over an algebraically closed field of zero characteristic, is automatically a derivation. In Section 4 we give examples of nilpotent Lie algebra (so-call filiform Lie algebras) which admit local derivations which are not derivations.

2. PRELIMINARIES

All algebras and vector spaces considered in the paper are over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$ with zero characteristic.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a Lie algebra. The *center* of $\mathcal{L}$ is denoted by $Z(\mathcal{L})$:

$$Z(\mathcal{L}) = \{x \in \mathcal{L} : [x, y] = 0, \forall\, y \in \mathcal{L}\}.$$

A Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is called *nilpotent* (respectively *solvable*) if $\mathcal{L}^k = \{0\}$ (respectively, if $\mathcal{L}^{(k)} = \{0\}$) for some integer k, where $\mathcal{L}^0 = \mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{L}^k = [\mathcal{L}^{k-1,}, \mathcal{L}]$, (respectively, $\mathcal{L}^{(0)} = \mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{L}^{(k)} = [\mathcal{L}^{(k-1)}, \mathcal{L}^{(k-1)}]$), $k \geq 1$. It is clear that nilpotent Lie algebras are solvable.

Any Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ contains a unique maximal solvable ideal, called the radical of $\mathcal{L}$ and denoted Rad$\mathcal{L}$. A non trivial Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is called *semisimple* if Rad$\mathcal{L} = 0$. This condition is equivalent to requiring that $\mathcal{L}$ have no nonzero abelian ideals.

A *derivation* on a Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is a linear map $D : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ which satisfies the Leibniz rule, that is

$$D([x, y]) = [D(x), y] + [x, D(y)]$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$. The set of all derivations of a Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is a Lie algebra with respect to commutation operation and it is denoted by Der$\mathcal{L}$. For any $a \in \mathcal{L}$, the map ad$(a) : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ defined as ad$(a)(x) = [a, x], x \in \mathcal{L}$, is a derivation, and derivations of this form are called *inner derivation*. The set of all inner derivations of $\mathcal{L}$ denoted ad$L$ is an ideal in Der$\mathcal{L}$. It is well known that any derivation on a finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebra is inner.

Recall that a linear map $\Delta : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ is called a *local derivation* if for every $x \in \mathcal{L}$, there exists a derivation $D_x : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ (depending on x) such that $\Delta(x) = D_x(x)$.

3. LOCAL DERIVATIONS OF FINITE-DIMENSIONAL SEMISIMPLE LIE ALGEBRAS

The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebra. Then any local derivation Δ on $\mathcal{L}$ is a derivation.*

A *Cartan subalgebra* $\mathcal{H}$ of a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is a nilpotent subalgebra which coincides with its centralizer: $C(\mathcal{H}) = \{x \in \mathcal{L} : [x, h] = 0, \forall h \in \mathcal{H}\} = \mathcal{H}$.

A Cartan subalgebra $\mathcal{H}$ of a finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is *abelian*, i.e. $[x, y] = 0$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$.

From now on in this section, we fix a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ and a Cartan subalgebra $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{L}$.

We will essentially use the following decomposition of finite-dimensional semisimple Lie algebras (see for details [6], [7]).

There exists a decomposition for $\mathcal{L}$, called the *root decomposition*

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{H} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in R} \mathcal{L}_\alpha,$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_\alpha = \{x \in \mathcal{L} : [h, x] = \alpha(h)x, \forall\, h \in \mathcal{H}\},$$

$$R = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{H}^* \setminus \{0\} : \mathcal{L}_\alpha \neq \{0\}\}$$

and $\mathcal{H}^*$ is the space of all linear functionals on $\mathcal{H}$. The set R is called the *root system* of $\mathcal{L}$, and subspaces $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ are called the *root subspaces*.

The above decomposition has the following important properties: If for each $\alpha \in R$ we take a non zero element $e_\alpha \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$, then

(a) $[e_\alpha, e_\beta] = n_{\alpha,\beta} e_{\alpha+\beta}$, if $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$ is a root, where $0 \neq n_{\alpha,\beta} \in \mathbb{F}$;
(b) $[e_\alpha, e_\beta] = 0$, if $\alpha + \beta \neq 0$ is not a root;
(c) $[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = h_\alpha \in \mathcal{H}$;
(d) $\mathcal{L}_\alpha = \mathbb{F} e_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in R$.

From the definition of the root subspaces it follows that

$$[h, e_\alpha] = \alpha(h) e_\alpha \text{ for all } h \in \mathcal{H}, \alpha \in R.$$

There exists a basis $B = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_l\}$ of $\mathcal{H}^*$ such that any root $\alpha \in R$ is a linear combination of the $\{\alpha_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq l}$ with integer coefficients (see [7]).

From now on we fixed co-called *Chevalley basis* $\left\{h_i = h_{\alpha_i} : i \in \overline{1, l}\right\} \cup \{e_\alpha : \alpha \in R\}$ in $\mathcal{L}$ with the property that all structure constants are integers, in particular, $\alpha(h_i)$ is integer for all $\alpha \in R$, $i \in \overline{1, l}$ and $n_{\alpha,\beta}$ is also integer for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$ with $\alpha + \beta \in R$.

Recall that a Lie algebra is *simple* if it has no non-trivial ideals and is not abelian. Any semisimple Lie algebra is the direct sum of its minimal ideals, which are canonically determined simple Lie algebras.

The following algebras are simple finite-dimensional Lie algebras:

- $A_n : \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F})$, the special linear Lie algebra;
- $B_n : \mathfrak{so}_{2n+1}(\mathbb{F})$, the odd-dimensional special orthogonal Lie algebra;
- $C_n : \mathfrak{sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{F})$, the symplectic Lie algebra;
- $D_n : \mathfrak{so}_{2n}(\mathbb{F})$, the even-dimensional special orthogonal Lie algebra.

These Lie algebras are numbered so that n is the rank, i.e. the dimension of Cartan subalgebra. These four families, together with five exceptions ($\mathfrak{e}_6$, $\mathfrak{e}_7$, $\mathfrak{e}_8$, $\mathfrak{f}_4$ and $\mathfrak{g}_2$), are in fact the only simple Lie algebras over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero (see [7]).

The proof of Theorem 3.1 consists of three steps. In the first step we will show that any local derivation Δ on semisimple Lie algebra can be represent in the form

$$\Delta = T + \mathrm{ad}(a),$$

where T is a local derivation such that $T|_{\mathcal{H}} \equiv 0$ and $a \in \mathcal{L}$.

Let us rewrite a root decomposition of $\mathcal{L}$ as

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \mathcal{L}_2,$$

where $\mathcal{L}_1 = H$, $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathrm{span}\{e_\alpha : \alpha \in R\}$. Then any local derivation on $\mathcal{L}$ can be represent as 2×2-matrix of the following form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where A_{ij} maps $\mathcal{L}_j$ into $\mathcal{L}_i$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq 2$.

Let $\{h_1, \cdots, h_l\}$ be a basis of $\mathcal{H}$. For

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \lambda_i h_i + \sum_{\alpha \in R} \lambda_\alpha e_\alpha$$

we denote

$$x_i = \lambda_i \text{ and } x_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha$$

for all $i \in \overline{1, l}$, $\alpha \in R$.

For any h_k $(1 \leq k \leq l)$ take an element $a = h_a + \sum\limits_{\gamma \in R} a_\gamma^{(k)} e_\gamma$ (depending on h_k) such that $\Delta(h_k) = [a, h_k]$. Since

$$\Delta(h_k) = [a, h_k] = \left[h_a + \sum_{\gamma \in R} a_\gamma^{(k)} e_\gamma, h_k \right] = \sum_{\gamma \in R} a_\gamma^{(k)} \gamma(h_k) e_\gamma,$$

it follows that $\Delta(h_k)_i = 0$ for all $i \in \overline{1, l}$. This means that $A_{11} = 0$. We also see that $A_{21} = (a_{\gamma,k})$, where $a_{\gamma,k} = a_\gamma^{(k)} \gamma(h_k)$ for all $\gamma \in R, k \in \overline{1, l}$. So, the matrix of Δ has the following form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.1}$$

Lemma 3.2. *For every $\gamma \in R$ there exist $d_\gamma \in \mathbb{F}$ and integers $r_{\gamma,i}$, $i = 1, \cdots, l$ such that $a_{\gamma,i} = r_{\gamma,i} d_\gamma$ for all i.*

Proof. Let $\gamma_0 \in R$ be a fixed root. Since $\{h_1, \cdots, h_l\}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{H}$, there exists $k \in \overline{1,l}$ such that $\gamma_0(h_k) \neq 0$. Set

$$d_{\gamma_0} = \frac{a_{\gamma_0,k}}{\gamma_0(h_k)}.$$

For $i \neq k$ put $h = \gamma_0(h_k)h_i - \gamma_0(h_i)h_k$. Using (3.1) we obtain that

$$\Delta(h)_{\gamma_0} = a_{\gamma_0,i}\gamma_0(h_k) - a_{\gamma_0,k}\gamma_0(h_i) = a_{\gamma_0,i}\gamma_0(h_k) - d_{\gamma_0}\gamma_0(h_k)\gamma_0(h_i).$$

On the other hand, we can find an element b (depending on h_k) such that $\Delta(h_k) = [b, h_k]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(h)_{\gamma_0} &= [b, h]_{\gamma_0} = \left[h_b + \sum_{\gamma \in R} b_\gamma e_\gamma, \gamma_0(h_k)h_i - \gamma_0(h_i)h_k \right]_{\gamma_0} = \\ &= -b_{\gamma_0}\gamma_0(h_k)\gamma_0(h_i) + b_{\gamma_0}\gamma_0(h_i)\gamma_0(h_k) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$a_{\gamma_0,i} = \gamma_0(h_i) d_{\gamma_0}$$

for all $i = 1, \cdots, l$. Since we use Shevalley basis, it follows that all $\gamma_0(h_i)$ are integers. The proof is complete. ☐

Set

$$h_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{l} t^k h_k, \tag{3.2}$$

where t is a fixed algebraic number from $\mathbb{F}$ of a degree bigger than $l = \dim \mathcal{H}$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $\Delta(h_0) = 0$. Then $\Delta|_H \equiv 0$.*

Proof. It is suffices to show that $A_{21} = 0$ for the matrix of the local derivation Δ.

For any $\gamma \in R$ we have

$$0 = \Delta(h_0)_\gamma = \sum_{k=1}^{l} a_{\gamma,k} t^k = \sum_{k=1}^{l} r_{\gamma,k} d_\gamma t^k = d_\gamma \sum_{k=1}^{l} r_{\gamma,k} t^k.$$

Since $r_{\gamma,1}, \cdots, r_{\gamma,l}$ are integers and the degree of the algebraic number t is bigger than l, it follows that $\sum\limits_{k=1}^{l} r_{\gamma,k} t^k \neq 0$. Therefore $d_\gamma = 0$, i.e. $a_{\gamma,k} = 0$ for all γ and k. This means that $A_{21} = 0$. The proof is complete. ☐

Let us take an element a such that $\Delta(h_0)=[a,h_0]$. Set

$$T=\Delta-\mathrm{ad}(a). \tag{3.3}$$

By Lemma 3.3 we have that $T|_{\mathcal{H}}\equiv 0$.

Now we are in position to pass to the second step of our proof. In this step we show that if a local derivation Δ annihilates a Cartan subalgebra $\mathcal{H}$, then it leaves invariant the root subspaces.

Let us first consider local derivations on a Lie algebra which is a direct sum of algebras $\mathfrak{sl}_{n_i+1}(\mathbb{F})$, where $n_1,\cdots,n_k\in\mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 3.4. *Any local derivation Δ on $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F})$ is a derivation.*

Proof. Let Δ be a local derivation on $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F})$. Let us extend Δ on $\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F})$ by

$$\Delta_0(x)=\Delta(x-\mathrm{tr}(x)\mathbf{1}),\ x\in\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F}),$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the identity matrix in $\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F})$ and tr is the trace on $\mathfrak{gl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{F})$ with $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{1})=1$. Since

$$\Delta_0(x)=\Delta(x-\mathrm{tr}(x)\mathbf{1})=[a_{x-\mathrm{tr}(x)\mathbf{1}},x-\mathrm{tr}(x)\mathbf{1}]=[a_{x-\mathrm{tr}(x)\mathbf{1}},x],$$

it follows that Δ_0 is a local associative derivation on $M_{n+1}(\mathbb{F})$. By [4, Theorem 2.3] we have that Δ_0 is an associative derivation and therefore a Lie derivation. Hence Δ is also a derivation. The proof is complete. ☐

Suppose that $\mathcal{L}=\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m}\mathcal{L}_i$ is a direct sum of semisimple Lie algebras $\mathcal{L}_i$. Since the center of semisimple Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is trivial, [5, P. 9, Theorem 1] implies that

$$\mathrm{Der}(\mathcal{L})=\bigoplus_{i=1}^{m}\mathrm{Der}(\mathcal{L}_i).$$

Thus any local derivation Δ on $\mathcal{L}$ can be decomposed as

$$\Delta=\Delta_1+\cdots+\Delta_m,$$

where Δ_i is a local derivation on $\mathcal{L}_i$ for all $i\in\overline{1,m}$.

This property together with Lemma 3.4 imply the following result.

Lemma 3.5. *Any local derivation Δ on $\bigoplus\limits_{i=1}^{m}\mathfrak{sl}_{n_i+1}(\mathbb{F})$ is a derivation.*

Let $\alpha,\beta\in R$. There exist integers p and q such that all

$$\beta-p\alpha,\cdots,\beta,\cdots,\beta+q\alpha$$

are roots, and this finite sequence is said to be *α-string through β*. The α-string through β contains at most four roots (see [6]).

Lemma 3.6. *Let Δ be a local derivation such that $\Delta|_H\equiv 0$. Then Δ maps span $\{h_\alpha,e_\alpha,e_{-\alpha}\}$ into itself for all $\alpha\in R$. Moreover*

$$\Delta(e_{\pm\alpha})=\pm c_\alpha e_{\pm\alpha} \tag{3.4}$$

for some $c_\alpha\in\mathbb{F}$.

Proof. Let $\alpha \in R$.

We are going to show that $\Delta(e_\alpha)_\gamma = 0$ for all $\gamma \in R$ with $\gamma \neq \pm\alpha$.

Take an element $a = h_a + \sum\limits_{\gamma\in R} a_\gamma e_\gamma$ (depending on e_α) such that $\Delta(e_\alpha) = [a, e_\alpha]$. Then

$$\Delta(e_\alpha) \quad = \quad \alpha(h_a)e_\alpha - a_{-\alpha}h_\alpha + \sum_{\gamma+\alpha\in R} a_\gamma n_{\gamma,\alpha}e_{\gamma+\alpha}. \tag{3.5}$$

This equality implies that $\Delta(e_\alpha)_\gamma = 0$ if $\gamma \neq \pm\alpha$ and $\gamma - \alpha$ is not a root, because γ can not be represented as a sum $\gamma = \gamma' + \alpha$.

Now let β be a root such that $\beta + \alpha$ is also a root.

It is suffices to consider the following three possible cases.

Case 1. The α-string through β contains 2 roots. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\beta, \beta + \alpha \in R$ and $\beta - \alpha \notin R$. Then the equality (3.5) implies that

$$\Delta(e_\alpha)_\beta = 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Since $\alpha \neq 0$, there exists an element $h \in H$ such that

$$\beta(h) = 1 \text{ and } (\beta + \alpha)(h) = 0.$$

Take an element $b \in \mathcal{L}$ such that

$$\Delta(h + e_\alpha) = [b, h + e_\alpha].$$

Taking into account that $\beta(h) = 1$ and $(\beta + \alpha)(h) = 0$, we obtain

$$\Delta(h + e_\alpha)_\beta = -b_\beta, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\Delta(h + e_\alpha)_{\beta+\alpha} = b_\beta n_{\beta,\alpha}. \tag{3.8}$$

Recall that $\Delta(h + e_\alpha) = \Delta(e_\alpha)$. Then (3.6) combined with (3.7) gives us $b_\beta = 0$. Thus from (3.8) it follows that

$$\Delta(h + e_\alpha)_{\beta+\alpha} = 0.$$

Again the equality $\Delta(h + e_\alpha) = \Delta(e_\alpha)$, implies that

$$\Delta(e_\alpha)_{\beta+\alpha} = 0.$$

Case 2. The α-string through β contains 3 roots $\beta, \beta + \alpha, \beta + 2\alpha \in R$. As in the previous case we obtain that

$$\Delta(e_\alpha)_\beta = \Delta(e_\alpha)_{\beta+\alpha} = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

Now take an element $h \in H$ such that

$$(\beta + \alpha)(h) = 1 \text{ and } (\beta + 2\alpha)(h) = 0.$$

Let c be an element such that

$$\Delta(h + e_\alpha) = [c, h + e_\alpha].$$

Using the definition of the element h from the last equality we obtain

$$\Delta(h + e_\alpha)_\beta = -2c_\beta, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\Delta(h+e_\alpha)_{\beta+\alpha} = c_{\beta+\alpha} + c_\beta n_{\beta,\alpha}, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\Delta(h+e_\alpha)_{\beta+2\alpha} = c_{\beta+\alpha} n_{\beta+\alpha,\alpha}. \tag{3.12}$$

Combining (3.9), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), we get $c_{\beta+\alpha} = 0$ and $\Delta(h+e_\alpha)_{\beta+2\alpha} = 0$. Since $\Delta(h+e_\alpha) = \Delta(e_\alpha)$, it follows that $\Delta(e_\alpha)_{\beta+2\alpha} = 0$.

Case 3. $\beta, \beta+\alpha, \beta+2\alpha, \beta+3\alpha \in R$. The proof is similar to the previous cases.

So, $\Delta(e_{\pm\alpha})_\gamma = 0$ for all $\gamma \in R$ with $\gamma \neq \pm\alpha$. This means that $\Delta(e_{\pm\alpha}) \in \text{span}\{h_\alpha, e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}\}$. Thus $\Delta|_{\text{span}\{h_\alpha, e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}\}}$ is a local derivation on $\text{span}\{h_\alpha, e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F})$, and therefore Lemma 3.4 implies that $\Delta|_{\text{span}\{h_\alpha, e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}\}}$ is a derivation. Since $\Delta(h_\alpha) = 0$, there exists $c \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\Delta|_{\text{span}\{h_\alpha, e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}\}} = \text{ad}(ch_\alpha)$. Therefore

$$\Delta(e_{\pm\alpha}) = [ch_\alpha, e_{\pm\alpha}] = \pm c\alpha(h_\alpha)e_{\pm\alpha}.$$

The proof is complete. □

In the third step we consider local derivations on the algebras $\mathfrak{so}_5(\mathbb{F})$ and $\mathfrak{g}_2$.

Let a be an element from (3.3). In the proofs of the following two Lemmas replacing, if necessary, the local derivation Δ by $\Delta - \text{ad}(a)$, we may assume that $\Delta|_{\mathcal{H}} \equiv 0$.

3.1. **Local derivations on $\mathfrak{so}_5(\mathbb{F})$.**

Lemma 3.7. *Any local derivation on $\mathfrak{so}_5(\mathbb{F})$ is a derivation.*

Proof. Let $\{\pm\alpha, \pm\beta, \pm(\alpha+\beta), \pm(\alpha+2\beta)\}$ be the root system of $\mathfrak{so}_5(\mathbb{F})$.

Since $\alpha + 3\beta = (\alpha+2\beta)+\beta$ is not a root, it follows that $[e_\alpha, e_{\alpha+2\beta}] = 0$. Thus

$$\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\} = \text{span}\left\{h_\alpha, h_{\alpha+2\beta}, e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}),$$

where $\text{alg}(S)$ is the Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}_5(\mathbb{F})$ generated by a subset $S \subset \mathfrak{so}_5(\mathbb{F})$. By Lemma 3.6 Δ maps $\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}$ into itself. Since

$$\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}),$$

Lemma 3.5 implies that $\Delta|_{\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}}$ is a derivation. Then there exists an element $h_1 \in H$ such that $\Delta|_{\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}} = \text{ad}(h_1)$, because $\Delta|_{\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}}$ is identically zero on a Cartan subalgebra of $\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}$.

Set

$$T = \Delta - \text{ad}(h_1).$$

Then

$$T(e_{\pm\alpha}) = T(e_{\pm(\alpha+2\beta)}) = 0.$$

Let us show that

$$T(e_{\pm\beta}) = T(e_{\pm(\alpha+\beta)}) = 0.$$

We have

$$T(e_\alpha + e_\beta + e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}) = \mu_\beta e_\beta. \tag{3.13}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T(e_\alpha+e_\beta+e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}) & = & [b, e_\alpha+e_\beta+e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}] = \\ & = & \alpha(h_b)e_\alpha+\beta(h_b)e_\beta-(\alpha+2\beta)(h_b)e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}+ \\ & + & *e_{\beta+\alpha}+*h_\alpha+*e_{-\beta}+ \\ & + & *e_{\beta+\alpha}+*e_{\alpha+2\beta}+*h_\beta+*e_{-\alpha}+*e_{-(\alpha+\beta)}+ \\ & + & *e_{-(\alpha+\beta)}+*e_{-\beta}+*h_{\alpha+2\beta}, \end{array}$$

where the symbols $*$ denote appropriate coefficients. We see that the last three rows in this equality does not contain e_α, e_β and $e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}$. Comparing the last equality with (3.13), we obtain that

$$\alpha(h_b)=(\alpha+2\beta)(h_b)=0$$

and

$$\mu_\beta=\beta(h_b).$$

The first two equalities give us $\alpha(h_b)=\beta(h_b)=0$, and therefore $\mu_\beta=0$. Thus

$$T(e_\beta)=0.$$

In a similar way we obtain

$$T(e_{-\beta})=0.$$

Now we will check that

$$T(e_{\pm(\alpha+\beta)})=0.$$

We have

$$T(e_{-\alpha}+e_{\alpha+\beta}+e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)})=\mu_{\alpha+\beta}e_{\alpha+\beta}.$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{array}{rcl} T(e_{-\alpha}+e_{\alpha+\beta}+e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}) & = & [c, e_{-\alpha}+e_{\alpha+\beta}+e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}] = \\ & = & -\alpha(h_c)e_{-\alpha}+(\alpha+\beta)(h_c)e_{\alpha+\beta}-(\alpha+2\beta)(h_c)e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}+ \\ & + & *h_\alpha+*e_\beta+*e_{-\alpha-\beta}+ \\ & + & *e_{\alpha+2\beta}+*e_\beta+*e_\alpha+*h_{\alpha+\beta}+*e_{-\beta}+ \\ & + & *e_{-(\alpha+\beta)}+*e_{-\beta}+*h_{\alpha+2\beta}. \end{array}$$

As in the previous case comparing coefficients of $e_\alpha, e_{\alpha+\beta}$ and $e_{-(\alpha+2\beta)}$ in the last two equalities, we obtain that

$$\alpha(h_c)=(\alpha+2\beta)(h_c)=0$$

and

$$\mu_{\alpha+\beta}=(\alpha+\beta)(h_c).$$

The first equalities give us $\alpha(h_c)=\beta(h_c)=0$, and therefore $\mu_{\alpha+\beta}=0$. Thus

$$T(e_{\alpha+\beta})=0.$$

Similarly

$$T(e_{-(\alpha+\beta)})=0.$$

So, we have proved that $T=0$. Thus $\Delta=\mathrm{ad}(h_1)$ is a derivation. The proof is complete. $\square$

3.2. Local derivations on the exceptional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_2$.

Lemma 3.8. *Any local derivation on $\mathfrak{g}_2$ is a derivation.*

Proof. Let $\{\pm\alpha, \pm\beta, \pm(\alpha+\beta), \pm(2\alpha+\beta), \pm(3\alpha+\beta), \pm(3\alpha+2\beta)\}$ be the root system of $\mathfrak{g}_2$.

Since $[e_\alpha, e_{3\alpha+2\beta}] = 0$, it follows that

$$\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}\right\} = \text{span}\left\{h_\alpha, h_{3\alpha+2\beta}, e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}).$$

By Lemma 3.6 the local derivation Δ maps $\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}$ into itself. Since

$$\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F})$$

Lemma 3.5 implies that $\Delta|_{\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}}$ is a derivation. Therefore there exists $h_1 \in H$ such that $\Delta|_{\text{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}\right\}} = \text{ad}(h_1)$.

Set

$$T = \Delta - \text{ad}(h_1).$$

Then

$$T(e_{\pm\alpha}) = T(e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}) = 0.$$

Let us to show that

$$T(e_\sigma) = 0,$$

where $\sigma = \pm\beta, \pm(\alpha+\beta), \pm(2\alpha+\beta), \pm(3\alpha+\beta)$.

Let us consider the case $\sigma = \pm\beta$. Then

$$T(e_\alpha + e_\beta + e_{-(3\alpha+2\beta)}) = \mu_\beta e_\beta. \tag{3.14}$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} T(e_\alpha + e_\beta + e_{-(3\alpha+2\beta)}) &= [c, e_\alpha + e_\beta + e_{-(3\alpha+2\beta)}] = \\ &= \alpha(h_c)e_\alpha + \beta(h_c)e_\beta - (3\alpha+2\beta)(h_c)e_{-(3\alpha+2\beta)} + \\ &+ \sum_{\gamma\in R}\left(c_\gamma n_{\gamma,\alpha}e_{\gamma+\alpha} + c_\gamma n_{\gamma,\beta}e_{\gamma+\beta} + c_\gamma n_{\gamma,-(3\alpha+2\beta)}e_{\gamma-3\alpha-\beta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Direct computations shows that the third summand in the last equality does not contain e_α, e_β and $e_{-(3\alpha+2\beta)}$. Comparing these components with same components in (3.14), we obtain that

$$\alpha(h_c) = (3\alpha+2\beta)(h_c) = 0$$

and

$$\mu_\beta = \beta(h_c).$$

The first equalities give us $\alpha(h_c) = \beta(h_c) = 0$, and therefore $\mu_\beta = 0$. Thus $T(e_\beta) = 0$.

In the same way we obtain that $T(e_{-\beta}) = 0$.

The remaining cases of σ are similar and can be checked in the following order:

$$\pm(2\alpha+\beta), \pm(3\alpha+\beta), \pm(\alpha+\beta).$$

In these cases instead of $e_\alpha + e_\beta + e_{-(3\alpha+2\beta)}$ we should use the following elements:

$$e_{\pm\beta} + e_{\pm(2\alpha+\beta)} + e_{\pm(3\alpha+2\beta)}, \quad e_{\pm\beta} + e_{\pm(3\alpha+\beta)} + e_{\mp(3\alpha+2\beta)}, \quad e_{\pm(3\alpha+\beta)} + e_{\pm(\alpha+\beta)} + e_{\mp\beta},$$

respectively. The proof is complete. □

Now we are in position to give the proof of the main result.

The main ingredient of the proof is reduction of the general case to the case of rank 2 simple Lie algebras.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $\Delta : \mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{L}$ be a local derivation and suppose that $h_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ is the element defined by (3.2). Take an element $a \in \mathcal{L}$ (depending on h_0) such that

$$\Delta(h_0) = [a, h_0].$$

Replacing, if necessary, the local derivation Δ by $\Delta - \mathrm{ad}(a)$, we may assume that $\Delta(h_0) = 0$, and therefore by Lemma 3.3 $\Delta|_{\mathcal{H}} \equiv 0$.

Firstly note that $\Delta|_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a derivation, because it is identically zero.

Let us show that

$$\Delta([h, e_\alpha]) = [\Delta(h), e_\alpha] + [h, \Delta(e_\alpha)] \tag{3.15}$$

for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\alpha \in R$. Indeed, taking into account that $\Delta|_{\mathcal{H}} \equiv 0$ and the equality (3.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta([h, e_\alpha]) &= \Delta(\alpha(h)e_\alpha) = \alpha(h)\Delta(e_\alpha) = \\ &= \alpha(h)c_\alpha e_\alpha = c_\alpha[h, e_\alpha] = [h, c_\alpha e_\alpha] = \\ &= [h, \Delta(e_\alpha)] = [\Delta(h), e_\alpha] + [h, \Delta(e_\alpha)]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we show that

$$\vec{}\Delta([e_\alpha, e_\beta]) = [\Delta(e_\alpha), e_\beta] + [e_\alpha, \Delta(e_\beta)] \tag{3.16}$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$. By Lemma 3.6 Δ maps $\mathrm{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm\beta)}\right\}$ into itself.

It is suffices to consider the following four possible cases (see [7, P. 44]):

1. $\mathrm{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F})$;
2. $\mathrm{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$;
3. $\mathrm{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{so}_5(\mathbb{F})$;
4. $\mathrm{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm\beta)}\right\} \cong \mathfrak{g}_2$.

In the first two cases Lemma 3.5 implies that $\Delta|_{\mathrm{alg}\left\{e_{\pm\alpha}, e_{\pm\beta)}\right\}}$ is a derivation and therefore Δ satisfies (3.16).

In a similar way in the remaining two cases we can apply Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8, respectively.

Finally, taking into account the linearity of Δ, the equalities (3.15) and (3.16), we obtain

$$\Delta([x, y]) = [\Delta(x), y] + [x, \Delta(y)]$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$. The proof is complete. □

4. LOCAL DERIVATIONS ON FILIFORM LIE ALGEBRAS

In this section we consider a special class of nilpotent Lie algebras, so-called filiform Lie algebras, and show that they admit local derivations which are not derivations.

A Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ is called *filiform* if $\dim \mathcal{L}^k = n-k-1$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, where $\mathcal{L}^0 = \mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{L}^k = [\mathcal{L}^{k-1}, \mathcal{L}]$, $k \geq 1$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a finite-dimensional filiform Lie algebra with $\dim \mathcal{L} \geq 3$. Then $\mathcal{L}$ admits a local derivation which is not a derivation.*

It is well-known [5, P. 58] that there is a unique three-dimensional filiform Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ with a basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ and multiplication rule $[e_1, e_2] = e_3$. This Lie algebra is known as the *Heisenberg algebra*.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a n-dimensional filiform Lie algebra with $n \geq 4$.

It is known [11] that there exists a basis $\{e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_n\}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ such that

$$[e_1, e_i] = e_{i+1} \tag{4.1}$$

for all $i \in \overline{2, n-1}$.

Note that a filiform Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ besides (4.1) may have also other non-trivial commutators.

From (4.1) it follows that $\{e_{k+2}, \cdots, e_n\}$ is a basis in $\mathcal{L}^k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n-2$ and $e_n \in Z(\mathcal{L})$.

Since $[\mathcal{L}^1, \mathcal{L}^{n-3}] \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{n-1} = \{0\}$, it follows that

$$[e_i, e_{n-1}] = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

for all $i = 3, \cdots, n$.

Now let us define a linear operator D on $\mathcal{L}$ by

$$D\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_k e_k\right) = \alpha x_2 e_{n-1} + \beta x_3 e_n, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$.

Lemma 4.2. *A linear operator D on $\mathcal{L}$ defined by (4.3) is a derivation if and only if $\alpha = \beta$.*

Proof. Suppose that a linear operator D defined by (4.3) is a derivation.

Since $[e_1, e_2] = e_3$, we have that

$$D([e_1, e_2]) = D(e_3) = \beta e_n.$$

Now using (4.1) we obtain that

$$[D(e_1), e_2] + [e_1, D(e_2)] = [0, e_2] + [e_1, \alpha e_{n-1}] = \alpha e_n.$$

Thus $\alpha = \beta$.

Conversely, let D be a linear operator defined by (4.3) with $\alpha = \beta$. We may assume that $\alpha = \beta = 1$.

In order to prove that D is a derivation it is sufficient to show that

$$D([e_i, e_j]) = [D(e_i), e_j] + [e_i, D(e_j)]$$

for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

Case 1. $i+j=3$. Then $i=1, j=2$ and in this case we can check as above.

Case 2. $i+j \geq 4$. Then $j \geq 3$, and therefore $[e_i, e_j] \in \mathcal{L}^{j+1} \subseteq \operatorname{span}\{e_4, \cdots, e_n\}$, which implies that $D([e_i, e_j]) = 0$.

Further $[e_i, D(e_j)] = 0$, because $D(e_j) = e_n \in Z(\mathcal{L})$ or $D(e_j) = 0$.

Now let us to show that $[D(e_i), e_j]$ is also zero. We have

$$[D(e_1), e_j] \;=\; [0, e_j] = 0.$$

Using (4.2) we obtain that

$$[D(e_2), e_j] \;=\; [e_{n-1}, e_j] = 0.$$

Finally

$$[D(e_i), e_j] = 0$$

for $i \geq 3$, because in this case $D(e_i) = e_n$ or $D(e_i) = 0$. So,

$$D([e_i, e_j]) = 0 = [D(e_i), e_j] + [e_i, D(e_j)].$$

The proof is complete. ☐

Remark 4.3. It is easy to see that Lemma 4.2 is also true for the three-dimensional Heisenberg algebra.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a n-dimensional filiform Lie algebra with $n \geq 3$. Consider the linear operator Δ defined by (4.3) with $\alpha = 2, \beta = 1$.

Lemma 4.4. *The linear operator Δ is a local derivation which is not a derivation.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.2, Δ is not a derivation.

Let us show that Δ is a local derivation. Denote by D_1 the derivation defined by (4.3) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$. Let D_2 be a linear operator on $\mathcal{L}$ defined by

$$D_2\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_k e_k\right) = x_2 e_n.$$

Since $D_2|_{[\mathcal{L},\mathcal{L}]} \equiv 0$ and $D_2(\mathcal{L}) \subseteq Z(\mathcal{L})$, it follows that

$$D_2([x, y]) = 0 = [D_2(x), y] + [x, D_2(y)]$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{L}$. So, D_2 is a derivation.

Finally, for any $x = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n} x_k e_k$ we find a derivation D such that $\Delta(x) = D(x)$.

Case 1. $x_2 = 0$. Then

$$\Delta(x) \;=\; x_3 e_n = D_1(x).$$

Case 2. $x_2 \neq 0$. Set

$$D = 2D_1 + tD_2,$$

where $t = -\frac{x_3}{x_2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D(x) &= 2D_1(x) + tD_2(x) = 2(x_2e_{n-1} + x_3e_n) + tx_2e_n = \\ &= 2x_2e_{n-1} + (2x_3 + tx_2)e_n = 2x_2e_{n-1} + x_3e_n = \Delta(x). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

REFERENCES

[1] S. Albeverio, Sh.A. Ayupov, K.K. Kudaybergenov, B.O. Nurjanov, Local derivations on algebras of measurable operators, *Communications in contemporary mathematics*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (2011) 643–657.

[2] Sh. A. Ayupov, K. K. Kudaybergenov, B. O. Nurjanov, A. K. Alauadinov, Local and 2-Local derivations on noncommutative Arens algebras, *Math. Slovaca*, Vol. 64, No 2, (2014) 423-432.

[3] Sh. A. Ayupov, K. K. Kudaybergenov, I. S. Rakhimov, 2-Local derivations on finite-dimensional Lie algebras, *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 474 (2015), 1-11.

[4] M. Breśar and P. Śemrl, Mapping which preserve idempotents, local automorphisms, and local derivations, *Canad. J. Math.* 45 (1993) 483-496.

[5] M. Goze, Yu. Khakimdjanov, Nilpotent Lie algebras, Kluwer Academic Pulisher, Dordrecht, 1996.

[6] N. Jacobson, Lie algebras, Dover Publications, Inc. New York, 1979.

[7] J. E. Humphreys, Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory, Springer, New York, 1972.

[8] B.E. Johnson, Local derivations on C*-algebras are derivations, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **353**, 313-325 (2001).

[9] R.V. Kadison, Local derivations, *J. Algebra* **130**, 494-509 (1990).

[10] D.R. Larson and A.R. Sourour, Local derivations and local automorphisms of $B(X)$, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* **51**, Part 2, Providence, Rhode Island 1990, pp. 187-194.

[11] M. Vergne, Réductibilité de la variretė des algébres de Lie nilpotentes, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris. 263 (1966), 4-6.

E-mail address: `sh_ayupov@mail.ru`

DORMON YOLI STR.,29, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN, 100125 TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN

E-mail address: `karim2006@mail.ru`

CH. ABDIROV STR., 1, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KARAKALPAK STATE UNIVERSITY, NUKUS 230113, UZBEKISTAN